



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,146	06/27/2003	Joel P. DeSouza	FIS920030091	1145
32674	7590	09/03/2009	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION			CHEN, JACK S J	
DEPT. 18G			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLDG. 321-482				2893
2070 ROUTE 52				
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EFIPLAW@US.IBM.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/604,146	Applicant(s) DESOUZA ET AL.
	Examiner Jack Chen	Art Unit 2893

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,7,8 and 27-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 7-8, 27-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 2, 8 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Re claim 2, the phrase “said semiconductor layer of said substrate disposed above said BOX layer consists essentially of single crystal silicon” is not supported by the original specification.

Re claim 8, the phrase “said first dose is *less than or equal to* $4 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ ” is not supported by the original specification.

Re claim 27, the phrase “*at least* to 1350 angstroms and said BOX layer has a first mini-breakdown voltage greater than about 75 volts” is not supported by the original specification.

Re claim 28, the phrase “up to a nominal thickness of 700 angstroms” is not supported by the original specification.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2893

4. Claims 1-2, 7-8 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 1, the phrase “BOX layer having a greater first mini-breakdown voltage” is unclear and indefinite as to what is considered as the greater first mini-breakdown voltage (i.e., compare to what?).

The remaining claims are rejected for depending from the above rejected claim.

For purpose of patentability, these claims will be interpreted as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith, US/4,786,608.

Re claim 1, Griffith discloses a method for forming a semiconductor device, which comprises implanting a base dose (i.e., 1.6E18-2.4E18) including oxygen ions (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 1-16) at a first energy level (i.e., 150 keV-200 keV) into a buried region (i.e., region 13 of fig. 1) disposed below a major surface 11 of a semiconductor substrate 15 to form an oxygen-implanted region 13 (fig. 1); implanting a second dose (i.e., 0.5-2E15) including at least one of oxygen ions or nitrogen ions (i.e., use oxygen or nitrogen ions instead of Si, see col. 5, line 62-

col. 6, line 10 and col. 4, lines 29-55) into said oxygen-implanted region (fig. 2) at a second energy level (i.e., 120-140 keV) while maintaining said substrate at room temperature (fig. 2, col. 4, lines 28-55); and annealing (col. 4 lines 55-68; in this case, oxygen ions is used as the source) said substrate to cause said ions implanted by said steps of implanting said base dose (i.e., oxygen ions, see fig. 1; col. 4, lines 1-16) and said second dose (i.e., oxygen ions, see fig. 2; col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 10) to be redistributed in said substrate and to react with a material of said substrate to form a buried oxide layer 13/22 or 13/32/33 (figs. 2-3, this is intrinsic properties of the material due to annealing; note: in this case, only oxide is formed) in said oxygen implanted region, said BOX layer 13/32/33 having an upper major surface adjoining a single - crystal semiconductor layer 14 of said substrate disposed above said BOX layer (see col. 4, lines 1-2) and said BOX layer having a lower major surface adjoining a single crystal semiconductor region 15 of said substrate disposed below said BOX layer (fig. 3); said BOX layer having a greater fist mini-breakdown voltage (i.e., the prior art process is considered as having greater fist mini-breakdown voltage for any thickness) for a least portion(s) of the it's thickness. see figs. 1-4 and cols. 1-8 for more details.

Re claim 2, wherein said semiconductor layer 14 of said substrate disposed above said BOX layer consists essentially of single crystal silicon (fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 1-10) and said BOX layer 13 includes silicon dioxide (fig. 4).

Re claim 31, inherently shows annealing includes using internal thermal oxidation to form said BOX layer (i.e., using the oxygen and/or implanted oxygen to react with si).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 7-8, 27-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griffith, US/4,786,608.

Griffith disclosed in above; however, Griffith is silent to the claimed ranges of instant claims 7-8, 27-30 and 32.

However, the claimed range of claims 7-8, 27-30 and 32 are considered to involve routine optimization while has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in *In re Aller*, the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

“Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however,

changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art...such ranges are termed Acritical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.”

In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In re Scherl* 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); *In re Irmscher* 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); *In re Norman* 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); *In re Swenson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); *In re Sola* 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); *In re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any suitable range in process of Griffith in order to optimize the process. Furthermore, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed process value(s) or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen limitations or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen limitations are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for reasons herein above.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-1689. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00am-4:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Davienne N. Monbleau can be reached on (571)272-1945. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2893

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jack Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2893

/Jack Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2893